

# **ATTACHMENT 18**

---

**BellSouth Interconnection Services**

675 West Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30375

**Carrier Notification  
SN91082645**

Date: October 12, 2001

To: Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs)

Subject: CLECs – Increase Time Limit to Supplement Local Service Requests (LSR) from  
10 Business Days to 30 Calendar Days Before Cancellation

This letter is in response to the Georgia Public Service Commission's Docket No. 6863-U to implement Operations Support Systems (OSS) upgrades. LSRs in clarification status will be canceled for no supplement (no sup) after 30 calendar days instead of the present procedure, which is after 10 business days. The change will also apply to manual LSRs. The change was effective for fully mechanized LSRs in Release 10.0a on Saturday, October 6, 2001. The change for partially mechanized and manual LSRs will be effective on Monday, October 15, 2001.

Please see the attached table for details of the release.

Please contact your BellSouth account team representative with any questions.

Sincerely,

**ORIGINAL SIGNED BY MATEO CAYMOL FOR JIM BRINKLEY**

Jim Brinkley – Senior Director  
BellSouth Interconnection Services

Attachment

# **ATTACHMENT 19**

**BellSouth CLEC Billing and Accounts Receivable Workshop**  
**Thursday, October 11, 2001**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Attendee List**

<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>COMPANY</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Anderson	Andy	KMC Telecom	<a href="mailto:cander@kmctelecom.com">cander@kmctelecom.com</a>
Bingham	Fred	WorldCom	<a href="mailto:Fred.Bingham@wcom.com">Fred.Bingham@wcom.com</a>
Bolen	Laura	Adelphia Business Solutions	
Butler	Amanda	BellSouth Interconnection Sales	<a href="mailto:Amanda.Butler@bellsouth.com">Amanda.Butler@bellsouth.com</a>
Calhoun	Stephan	Cbeyond Communications	<a href="mailto:Stephan.calhoun@cbeyond.net">Stephan.calhoun@cbeyond.net</a>
Carter	Joy	BellSouth Telecommunications	<a href="mailto:Joy.Carter@BellSouth.com">Joy.Carter@BellSouth.com</a>
Chia	Brian	Vibrant Solutions	
Connell	Mary	IDS Telecom	
Conquest	Mary	ITC DeltaCom	<a href="mailto:mconquest@itcdeltacom.com">mconquest@itcdeltacom.com</a>
Danemayer	Albert	Cinergy Comm. Company	
Duffey	John	FLA PSC	<a href="mailto:JDuffey@PSC.STATE.FL.US">JDuffey@PSC.STATE.FL.US</a>
Fisher	Glen	FLA PSC	
Forbes	George	Access Integrated Networks	<a href="mailto:george.forbes@accesscomm.com">george.forbes@accesscomm.com</a>
Fountain	Gail	BellSouth Telecommunications	<a href="mailto:Gail.Fountain@bridge.bellsouth.com">Gail.Fountain@bridge.bellsouth.com</a>
Gena	Jon	KPMG Consulting	
Hardy	Annette	Access Integrated Networks	<a href="mailto:Annette.hardy@accesscomm.com">Annette.hardy@accesscomm.com</a>
Haynes	Cheryl	Nuvox Communications	
Hewitt	Greg	Electric Power Bd. of Chatt.	<a href="mailto:Hewittgs@epb.net">Hewittgs@epb.net</a>
Hill	Amanda	WorldCom	
Johnson	Deborah	BellSouth Telecommunications	<a href="mailto:Deborah.Johnson4@bridge.bellsouth.com">Deborah.Johnson4@bridge.bellsouth.com</a>
Joiner	Torri	BellSouth Telecommunications	<a href="mailto:Torri.Joiner@bridge.bellsouth.com">Torri.Joiner@bridge.bellsouth.com</a>
Massaquoi	Maxwell	KPMG Consulting	
Mbowe	Alhagi	WorldCom	
Mooreman	Michelle	BST-Interconnection Services	<a href="mailto:Michelle.Moorman@bridge.bellsouth.com">Michelle.Moorman@bridge.bellsouth.com</a>
Murphy	Linda	AT&T	<a href="mailto:lindam@att.com">lindam@att.com</a>
McFall	Thomas	BST-Interconnection Services	<a href="mailto:Thomas.Mcfall1@bridge.bellsouth.com">Thomas.Mcfall1@bridge.bellsouth.com</a>
McMahon	Brent	Network Telephone Inc.	
O'Bryan	Susan	BellSouth Telecommunications	<a href="mailto:Susan.O'Bryan@bridge.bellsouth.com">Susan.O'Bryan@bridge.bellsouth.com</a>
Parker	Marilyn	WorldCom	
Pinick	Paul	Birch Telecom	<a href="mailto:PPinick@birch.com">PPinick@birch.com</a>
Rodriguez	Millie	Atlantic.net	
Rull	Kim	Vibrant Solutions	
Sheehan	John	BellSouth Telecommunications	<a href="mailto:John.Sheehan@bridge.bellsouth.com">John.Sheehan@bridge.bellsouth.com</a>
Spann	Jackie	BellSouth Telecommunications	<a href="mailto:Jacquelyn.spann@bridge.bellsouth.com">Jacquelyn.spann@bridge.bellsouth.com</a>
Stapler	Shamone	ITC DeltaCom	<a href="mailto:ssapler@itcdeltacom.com">ssapler@itcdeltacom.com</a>
Thomas	Audrey	BellSouth Telecommunications	<a href="mailto:Audrev.Thomas@bridge.bellsouth.com">Audrev.Thomas@bridge.bellsouth.com</a>
Wagner	Mel	Birch Telecom	
Ward	Christina	Atlantic.net	
Whishamore	Rick	MCI	
Wilds	Louise	Access Integrated Networks	<a href="mailto:Louise.wilds@accesscomm.com">Louise.wilds@accesscomm.com</a>
Wright	Bill	Phone Reconnect of America	

Audrey Thomas, Network Services, welcomed all attendees and began with coverage of housekeeping details. She emphasized that a "Parking Lot" would be maintained throughout the meeting to record any questions or issues that were not immediately addressed during the workshop. Audrey then reviewed the remainder of the agenda:

- Overview of Billing and Accounts Receivable Upgrade
- Review of the Potential Difference and Examples
- Potential Process Changes
- Current Implementation Schedule
- Question and Answer Session
- Feedback

*Brent McMahan*, Networkworld Telecommunications, questioned why the changes being discussed in this meeting were not submitted through Change Control Process. *Fred Bingham* and *Amanda Hill* of WorldCom and *Mel Wagner* of Birch Telecom seconded the question. *Audrey Thomas*, BellSouth Network Services responded that the changes that would be covered are primarily to BellSouth's Billing Infrastructure, and would not impact the way we do business with our customers. *Susan O'Bryan* added that these infrastructure changes are specific to BellSouth's Billing Systems and will have no impact on the way UNE orders are issued by the CLECs. This issue was boarded for follow-up with CCP management.

*Fred Bingham* further questioned who was invited to this workshop and if the CCP distribution list was used to send notice regarding this meeting to the CLECs. *Audrey Thomas* responded that the distribution list maintained by BellSouth Interconnection Services Marketing and had been used for the BellSouth CLEC Inforum this summer was the list that had been used for the invitation to this workshop. In addition, CLEC account team management was copied on this invitation to ensure appropriate coverage. The CCP distribution list will be obtained and added to the current distribution list for dissemination of minutes and responses to issues. Also, the materials distributed in Workshop will be sent to this combined distribution list.

The question was asked if the Change Control Process will be used for future CBOS changes. *Susan O'Bryan* responded that CBOS changes are governed through OBF and will continue to be handled in that manner. Existing notification processes associated with CBOS releases will continue to apply.

#### ***Overview of Billing and Accounts Receivable Upgrade***

*Susan O'Bryan*, BellSouth Billing Incorporated (BBI), conducted an overview of the planned upgrade to BellSouth's UNE (Unbundled Network Elements) Billing Infrastructure. She shared that the planned upgrades will result in a system that remains compliant to all standards that BellSouth is subject to today and that is equal to what CLECs have today.

She began with a review of the applications and products and services that will be included in this upgrade. These upgrades impact UNE's currently billed through CRIS. This includes unbundled switch ports, port/loop combinations (including UNE-P) and unbundled loops (Service level 1 only). There are no changes for access related services. The question was asked if any USOCs be changed. *Susan O'Bryan* answered that no USOCs will be changed as a result of the upgrades to the Billing and Accounts Receivable systems.

There are three major areas of this upgrade. The Billing applications that are being upgraded are the rating application for calculation usage and monthly charges and the Bill formatting and application tool. Additionally, the screens and tools used by the ICS Billing and Collections Centers Service Representatives to log, track and manage adjustments will be upgraded. There are no changes on the account/order issuance side of the process.

Bill day processing will be upgraded by the replacement of the current BIBS application for processing and rating of usage/call detail records. After the upgrade is complete, the messages will be sent via DUF identical to current process. CLECs will receive the same J and N Bill formats. Service Orders will flow as today and update to the current Accounts Database. However, rated usage events will be summarized with "like" charges and stored until bill day. This will create greater processing efficiency and reduce overall run time for bill processing. Usage will be rerated as today based on service order activity and changes affecting guiding. CSR details (from the Accounts Database) will be used to apply monthly and fractional charges and payments and adjustments made since the prior bill will be received and used for

calculating invoice specific balance due. Taxes and late payments charges will be calculated as appropriate.

A new GUI will be available for BellSouth staff to enter contract and price list rate information when appropriate to override the tariff rates. This change will result in contract rates being made effective in a faster timeframe and thus reducing the overall number of adjustments required by today's process. The net result is better service to BellSouth's customers. The **retroactive rate change** process will be modified to simplify and handle "as negotiated" amounts. This is an added benefit of table driven rates vs. this information remaining hard-coded as it is today.

A new formatting tool will be used to map bill content (specific charges, credits and miscellaneous items) to the printed page. CBOS standard bill formats will be delivered. Bill Data Transmissions will comply with standards as well. Customer Service Record (CSR) details will be provided from Accounts Database as today for inclusion with both the paper bill image and BDT files. Bill images will be updated to ICABS like today for viewing by BellSouth Service Representatives.

Invoice details will be maintained in an Oracle Accounts Receivable database for use by the Billing & Collection Service Representatives. New GUIs for BellSouth staff will be available for creating and managing deposits and adjustments. BellSouth user maintained tables will be available for establishing late payment charge and collection /treatment parameters and rules. Invoice numbers will be assigned and used when directing payments and adjustments to be applied to specific balances.

#### ***Benefits of Planned UNE Billing Upgrade***

The primary benefit of the planned upgrades is to ensure that BellSouth systems and applications are prepared for CLEC UNE growth. This includes increases in the number of subscribers, requests for single bill cycle, growth across the nine state region and end user usage volumes. By implementing these improvements, BellSouth will be adding more table driven flexibility for implementing new products, contracts and bill formats, enabling the BST to accommodate these service changes faster and more effectively. These changes will also provide the tools that will better enable BellSouth Service Reps to respond to billing questions and inquiries. The question was asked "Can BellSouth Bill all states accounts in the same billing cycle?" *Susan O'Bryan* responded that this is possible, but advised the CLECs to negotiate this type of arrangement through their respective account teams. There may be constraints that would not allow the use of a specific bill period, such as a large account already billing there.

#### ***Potential Differences and Examples***

##### **Additional Data to be Populate/Provided on BDT and Paper Bills/CSRs**

*Jackie Spann*, BBI, presented an overview of the potential differences of the current system and the upgraded system. She provided examples to illustrate what the customer would see on a bill or CSR. The invoice number will be added for J and N bills. This will facilitate the correct application of payments and reduce the number of adjustments. "From" and "Thru" dates will always be fielded in OC&C records. The display of this information has been changed to make it easier to locate. Service outage OC&C will no longer contain the BellSouth internal "Z" service order number. Circuit outages will contain the WFA number and TN outages will contain the LMOS tracking number in the purchase order number (PON) field. *Mary Conquest*, ITC DeltaCom, asked if the customer will be able to track the CMS number to the WFA/LMOS tracking number for service outages. BellSouth placed this question in the parking lot for follow-up. OCL, CKL and CKLT data will be passed in OC&Cs and other applicable records. A zone indicator will be passed when BellSouth begins mechanized zone pricing (a post Billing changes implementation is planned).

The question was asked, "How will OC&Cs be charged for Retroactive Rate Changes?" Jackie Spann responded that BellSouth Interconnection Services is working with the Account Teams on contract effective dates and associated rates. The cost of rating retroactively is not favorable for the CLEC or BellSouth. The account teams are happy to discuss settlement issues with the customers. Process for

providing details to the CLECs for retroactive rate changes needs to be defined and communicated to the CLECs. BellSouth placed this issue in the parking lot for follow-up.

#### Bill/CSR Display & Standard Phrase Codes

Refunds of deposits will appear in the OC&C section rather than adjustment section of the bill. BDT service order records will not be generated for deposit interest and deposit refund OC&Cs. This change is to better align the presentation of this information with the standards. There will be a transition to more standardized phrase codes. Some phrase codes will be locally defined. Examples are:

Z11 – “One time charge for \_\_\_\_\_”

Z13 – “One time credit for \_\_\_\_\_”

ZBC – “Credit for Miscellaneous Activity”

ZBD – “Charge for Miscellaneous Activity”

ZIA – “Additional credit for interruption of service”

ZIB – “Reduction in credit for interruption of service”

The Service Order history section will show “Tapestry” rather than today’s rate change verbiage. This will only be seen on a Service Orders when there is a rate change.

#### Rating Differences or Changes

Taxing of usage charges based on effective date of jurisdiction changes (rather than based on taxability on bill day). Cross boundary usage billed based on stated of billing account rather than the state of the CLLI (recording location). A request was made by *Mary Conquest*, ITC DeltaCom asked to receive a complete list of Cross Boundary Billing RAO’s. BellSouth placed this request in the parking lot for follow-up. Contract usage rating defaults to LEC LIDB if not specified in contract (current default is foreign LIDB). Rounding differences may occur on USOCs with quantity greater than one and a discount applicable. An example of the difference in this calculation was provided. Calculation of fractional charges based on exact number of days during the period rather than always assuming 30 days per month. *Mel Wagner* of Birch Telecom questioned the justification for BellSouth going to the exact number of days for the calculation of fractional charges. He challenged if this was in compliance with industry standard. His information indicated that the industry standard was 30 days. BellSouth placed this question in the parking lot for follow-up.

#### Interim Issues

Minimum Period Charges will not be calculated or billed initially. There is still work to be done to fully develop the process for the calculation of Minimum Period Charges in the upgraded Billing system. Until that process is completed, BellSouth will not bill Minimum Period Charges.

Usage quantity and MOU will not be passed initially when a detailed usage adjustment is made, i.e. retroactive rate changes - a separate list or spreadsheet of details will be made available. *Mel Wagner* of Birch Telecom raised the question why the minutes of usage (MOUs) for a retroactive rate change will not be passed by the upgraded system. *Susan O’Bryan* responded that the MOUs only applies to retroactive rate changes and BellSouth is attempting to simplify that process. BellSouth will provide the CLECs with a spreadsheet that provides this detail. *Mel Wagner* then asked why that information could not be sent as detail with the BDT. *Susan O’Bryan* advised that it could not be sent, but would be provided separately. BellSouth will define the process for sending the MOU information to the CLECs. A further question was raised of how the CLECs will be notified when Minimum Period Charges will be billed. *Susan O’Bryan* responded that all appropriate notification procedures will be observed when a process is development and implemented.

#### Potential Process Changes

The invoice number will be added to the remittance document and available for use in application of payments, adjustments and disputes. If an invoice number is not used, payments, lump sum adjustments and good will adjustments will be prorated across all outstanding invoices. *Linda Murphy*, AT&T asked if payments will be posted to their bill number. Her company currently does not use invoice numbers within their system. *Joy Carter*, BBI committed to meet with *Linda* off-line to go over the possible impact of these changes for AT&T.

***Current Implementation Schedule***

The final area covered was the planned implementation schedule:

**October**

- Complete BellSouth Testing
- Provide BDT Test Tapes to Specific CLECs, beginning 10/12. A question was raised as to when the Test tapes would be received. Test tapes for those CLECs who have contractual agreement for the tapes to be provided. Mississippi tapes will be distributed first, with delivery expected on or about Oct 16, 2001.

**November**

- Upgrade applications in Mississippi-11/9
- Upgrade applications in Georgia-11/30

**December**

- Upgrade applications in Florida-12/14
- Establish 2002 schedule for remaining states

*Mel Wagner* of Birch Telecom asked how do the implementation dates relate to customer Bill cycles. The planned dates are shown above is state specific. The relationship will be based on the bill date in a specific site.

Parking Lot issues were recapped. Audrey Thomas notified this audience that if there were any issues that were unclear about the planned upgrade, that a subsequent session would be planned. There was no request from the CLEC body to do so at this time.

Parking Lot issues will be responded to and sent along with minutes to the combined distribution list.

The meeting was adjourned.



## BellSouth Billing and Accounts Receivable Upgrade CLEC Workshop October 11, 2001

### “Parking Lot” Issues

The following items were recorded during the BellSouth Billing and Accounts Receivable Upgrade CLEC Workshop. Below are the responses:

Inquirer	Parking Lot Issue /Question	Assigned To	Response
Mary Conquest, ITC DeltaCom	Will the CLECs be able to track the CMS number to the WFA/LMOS tracking number for service outages?	Jackie Spann, BBI	The WFA ticket number is assigned locally by WFA when the outage is reported. As such, it probably cannot be associated with any number internally defined by your company. Likewise, the LMOS tracking number is assigned locally by LMOS when the outage is reported. As such, it probably cannot be associated with any number internally defined by your company either.
Mary Conquest, ITC DeltaCom	Is there a Cross Boundary Locations list and can a copy be provided to the CLEC?	Jackie Spann, BBI	A copy of the list of Cross Boundary NPAs/NXXs with RAO codes was provided to Mary Conquest on 10/12/01. That list is attached to this distribution. See attachment named “XBOUNDNXX.DOC”
	How and when will the CLECs be notified that BellSouth will begin Minimum Period Charges	Susan O’Bryan, BBI	Process to address this issue is under development. Standard BellSouth notification procedures will be followed.
Linda Murphy, AT&T	Will payments be posted to the CLECs bill number? What will be the impact if the CLEC’s system only recognizes bill numbers and not invoice numbers.	Joy Carter, BBI	Prior to the conclusion of the workshop, Linda Murphy reported that she had confirmed with her organization that AT&T does recognize the invoice number. On 10/15/01 Joy Carter sent an e-mail, extending the option to meet with Linda Murphy to address any further concerns around this issue.
Mel Wagner, Birch Telecom	Why is BellSouth changing to using the exact number of days in a bill period for the calculation of fractional charges? He understands 30 days is the industry standard.	Jackie Spann, BBI	Our research has indicated that there are no industry-defined standards for this calculation. This includes TRG, OBF and GSST Tariff.
	The process for providing details to the CLECs for retroactive rate changes needs to be defined and communicated to the CLECs	Susan O’Bryan, Jackie Spann, BBI	Process to address this issue is under development. Standard BellSouth notification procedures will be followed.

<p>Mel Wagner,          Birch Tel.,          Brent          McMahan,          Network          Tel., Fred          Bingham,          Amanda          Hill,          WorldCom</p>	<p>The CLECs questioned why          these changes being discussed          in this meeting were not          submitted through Change          Control Process.</p>	<p>Audrey          Thomas,          Deborah          Johnson,          BST</p>	<p>In the BellSouth Change Control process          Billing is not specified as in-scope. The          CCP document states the following in the          Introduction: Objectives of the Change          Control Process:          “- Support the Industry guidelines that          impact Electronic Interfaces and manual          processes relative to order, pre-order,          maintenance, and billing as appropriate. “          At this time, CCP is not addressing          Billing related changes.</p>
--	--	--	---

# **ATTACHMENT 20**

## BST/MCI CAVE KICKOFF CALL

Date of Call: Sept 7, 2001

Time of Call: 3:30 pm

### Attendees:

#### BST

Pamela Reynolds  
Venkatesan Subramanian  
Tammy Higgins  
Torrance Sanford  
Joe Laszlo  
Brenda Thomas  
Sharon Daniels

#### MCI

Fred Brigham  
Patricia Woods  
Tyra Hush  
Micki Jones

BST/MCI introduced attendees on the call

MCI advised BST problems with some of the test cases

- BST advised this could be discussed on this call with test manager

WorldCom requested explanation of the BST Testing process and how changes to the testing dates are handled.

- BST advised that the BST test agreement process requires that all testing must be performed within the agreed upon dates within each phase.

- All changes must be re-negotiated, requiring an addendum and new signatures from both BST and WorldCom representatives.

- The purpose of the BST Test Kick-Off meeting is primarily to agree on the dates for testing, finalize the testing agreement document and review EDI Functionality to be tested. In addition, contact information is provided during this meeting.

MCI/BST agreed on all dates for test agreement with the exception of close date of Oct 5 and the PVT date. WorldCom prefers to send shake-out tests (PVT) on Oct 6. However, due to the fact that BST does not support testing on the week-end, this date was not acceptable to BST.

- MCI advised BST the end test date needs to be extended to Oct 12, MCI also advised VP escalation in progress to have BST extend CAVE testing to the above date

- BST/MCI agreed to send out test agreement with close date of Oct 5 and an addendum would be made to test agreement with the BST approval of close date of Oct 12

- BST test manager will send test agreement on Sept 10, 2001

- MCI will review and return test agreement on same day

MCI/BST discussed problem with test cases data

- BST advised that they only provide test data for required fields. They did not realize from our test plan, that additional test data was being requested for optional fields.

- MCI indicated on test case number 8, the service address information was not clearly stated and this is needed

- BST agreed to provide service address field information by COB (or earlier) on Sept 10, 2001
- MCI inquired about TNS and EATN on test cases 2 and 11
  - MCI indicated BST provided duplicate telephone numbers
  - BST clarified that the TNS number and the EATN are different
  - MCI satisfied with clarification given by BST
- Test Case #11 (2 line move) -- WorldCom inquired about the TN for the second line.
  - BST advised that only one TN is required on a move order, so that is the only data they provided.
  - WorldCom is satisfied with the clarification provided by BST.

MCI inquired why CCNA and CC on the test cases provided by BST is not the actual production data

- MCI stated this causes internal issues and manual intervention
  - MCI systems not built for false CCNA and CC (non-production data) and this information should be real
  - BST stated when customer is testing in CAVE, BST provides required field information and TNs
- ~~-MCI stated the understanding of CAVE is to mimic production and the CCNA and CC do not belong to MCI and therefore CAVE is not allowing MCI to mimic production~~
- BST CAVE product manager gave technical and functional explanation about CCNA and CC
  - BST stated that CAVE is a front-end ordering process with interfaces with the BST back-end production systems. CAVE is designed to mimic production functionality and is integrated into their production systems.
  - BST stated the CC is used by BST to track the test order through the CAVE production systems so it does not go to production billing.
  - BST stated that the difference between CAVE and the traditional testing environment is
    - CAVE, BST provides the test data
    - traditional testing environment, CLEC must provide "friendly" production accounts.

-MCI stated, based on the BST explanation, CAVE is not a stand-alone test environment and does not mimic production

MCI inquired if CAVE is available for testing on weekends

- BST verified there are no resources to monitor testing on weekends, MCI can send test data during weekend, but BST will pickup monitoring on Monday mornings
- BST recommended that WorldCom NOT send test cases on the week-ends, as they could not guarantee that they would be processed properly.

MCI stated testing to verify if MCI systems are flowing correctly and MCI wants to test as close to live production as possible

- MCI re-stated BST's explanation of CAVE is a front end-ordering piece

-BST stated CAVE is exact replicate of the BST front end ordering systems which interfaces with BST ~~of production that rely on production~~ OSS systems

-MCI asked what does BST do with orders after transaction are sent

-BST stated CAVE orders are tracked by the test manager

MCI inquired about the flow thru of transactions with CAVE ~~versus production~~, what orders flow electronically or fall for manual handling

-BST account team advised manual-handling issue is being addressed on the weekly UNE-P conference call

-BST stated CLEC community was provided documentation and walk through of CAVE early in the year

-MCI requested copy of documentation

-BST agreed to provide documentation (WHEN?)

MCI requested weekly call for testing

-BST advised that BST will send a daily status summary of test cases at the end of each day.

-BST advised that special cases will require additional handling

-BST test manager advised she is available at all times to MCI

-BST/MCI agree to conduct 30 minute call every Wednesday at 10:00am to discuss status of testing

-BST will provide bridge information (WHEN?)

BST test manager request MCI sends 5 orders ~~on Monday~~ each day

-MCI agreed to send 5 ~~on Monday~~ each day when possible, but stated there may be delays on sending others

-MCI still requesting to send transactions on weekends

-BST test manager will investigate request

-BST advised that WorldCom can send PVT test cases on the week-end.

However, there will not be BST test team support on the weekends.

WorldCom is free to handle any problems through the normal help-desk process.

BST test manager provided office number to MCI

-MCI accepted and requested pager number

-BST test manager will provide to MCI (WHEN?)

-BST test manager request MCI allow BST time to respond to call

MCI request PVT date on agreement to remain Oct 6 (Saturday)

-BST will note a test agreement MCI will send production on Saturday, Oct 6 and

BST will place PVT date of Oct 8 on test agreement

## BST/MCI CAVE KICKOFF CALL

Date of Call: Sept 7, 2001

Time of Call: 3:30 pm

### Attendees:

#### BST

Pamela Reynolds  
Venkatesan Subramanian  
Tammy Higgins  
Torrance Sanford  
Joe Laszlo  
Brenda Thomas  
Sharon Daniels

#### MCI

Fred Brigham  
Patricia Woods  
Tyra Hush  
Micki Jones

BST/MCI introduced attendees on the call

MCI advised BST problems with some of the test cases

- BST advised this could be discussed on this call with test manager

WorldCom requested explanation of the BST Testing process and how changes to the testing dates are handled.

- BST advised that the BST test agreement process requires that all testing must be performed within the agreed upon dates within each phase.

- All changes must be re-negotiated, requiring an addendum and new signatures from both BST and WorldCom representatives.

- The purpose of the BST Test Kick-Off meeting is primarily to agree on the dates for testing, finalize the testing agreement document and review EDI Functionality to be tested. In addition, contact information is provided during this meeting.

MCI/BST agreed on all dates for test agreement with the exception of close date of Oct 5 and the PVT date. WorldCom prefers to send shake-out tests (PVT) on Oct 6. However, due to the fact that BST does not support testing on the week-end, this date was not acceptable to BST.

- MCI advised BST the end test date needs to be extended to Oct 12, MCI also advised VP escalation in progress to have BST extend CAVE testing to the above date

- BST/MCI agreed to send out test agreement with close date of Oct 5 and an addendum would be made to test agreement with the BST approval of close date of Oct 12

- BST test manager will send test agreement on Sept 10, 2001

- MCI will review and return test agreement on same day

MCI/BST discussed problem with test cases data

- BST advised that they only provide test data for required fields. They did not realize from our test plan, that additional test data was being requested for optional fields.

- MCI indicated on test case number 8, the service address information was not clearly stated and this is needed

-BST agreed to provide service address field information by COB (or earlier) on Sept 10, 2001

-MCI inquired about TNS and EATN on test cases 2 and 11

-MCI indicated BST provided duplicate telephone numbers

-BST clarified that the TNS number and the EATN are different

-MCI satisfied with clarification given by BST

-Test Case #11 (2 line move) -- WorldCom inquired about the TN for the second line.

-BST advised that only one TN is required on a move order, so that is the only data they provided.

-WorldCom is satisfied with the clarification provided by BST.

MCI inquired why CCNA and CC on the test cases provided by BST is not the actual production data

-MCI stated this causes internal issues and manual intervention

-MCI systems not built for false CCNA and CC (non-production data) and this information should be real

-BST stated when customer is testing in CAVE, BST provides required field information and TNs

~~-MCI stated the understanding of CAVE is to mimic production and the CCNA and CC do not belong to MCI and therefore CAVE is not allowing MCI to mimic production~~

-BST CAVE product manager gave technical and functional explanation about CCNA and CC

-BST stated that CAVE is a front-end ordering process with interfaces with the BST back-end production systems. CAVE is designed to mimic production functionality and is integrated into their production systems.

-BST stated the CC is used by BST to track the test order through the CAVE production systems so it does not go to production billing.

-BST stated that the difference between CAVE and the traditional testing environment is

- CAVE, BST provides the test data
- traditional testing environment, CLEC must provide "friendly" production accounts.

-MCI stated, based on the BST explanation, CAVE is not a stand-alone test environment and does not mimic production

MCI inquired if CAVE is available for testing on weekends

-BST verified there are no resources to monitor testing on weekends, MCI can send test data during weekend, but BST will pickup monitoring on Monday mornings

-BST recommended that WorldCom NOT send test cases on the week-ends, as they could not guarantee that they would be processed properly.

MCI stated testing to verify if MCI systems are flowing correctly and MCI wants to test as close to live production as possible

-MCI re-stated BST's explanation of CAVE is a front end-ordering piece



-BST stated CAVE is exact replicate of the BST front end ordering systems which interfaces with BST ~~of production that rely on production~~ OSS systems

-MCI asked what does BST do with orders after transaction are sent

-BST stated CAVE orders are tracked by the test manager

MCI inquired about the flow thru of transactions with CAVE ~~versus production~~, what orders flow electronically or fall for manual handling

-BST account team advised manual-handling issue is being addressed on the weekly UNE-P conference call

-BST stated CLEC community was provided documentation and walk through of CAVE early in the year

-MCI requested copy of documentation

-BST agreed to provide documentation (WHEN?)

MCI requested weekly call for testing

-BST advised that BST will send a daily status summary of test cases at the end of each day.

-BST advised that special cases will require additional handling

-BST test manager advised she is available at all times to MCI

-BST/MCI agree to conduct 30 minute call every Wednesday at 10:00am to discuss status of testing

-BST will provide bridge information (WHEN?)

BST test manager request MCI sends 5 orders ~~on Monday~~ each day

-MCI agreed to send 5 ~~on Monday~~ each day when possible, but stated there may be delays on sending others

-MCI still requesting to send transactions on weekends

-BST test manager will investigate request

-BST advised that WorldCom can send PVT test cases on the week-end.

However, there will not be BST test team support on the weekends.

WorldCom is free to handle any problems through the normal help-desk process.

BST test manager provided office number to MCI

-MCI accepted and requested pager number

-BST test manager will provide to MCI (WHEN?)

-BST test manager request MCI allow BST time to respond to call

MCI request PVT date on agreement to remain Oct 6 (Saturday)

-BST will note a test agreement MCI will send production on Saturday, Oct 6 and

BST will place PVT date of Oct 8 on test agreement

# **ATTACHMENT 21**

REPORT NAME: CLEC LSR Information  
REPORT PERIOD: 08/01/2001 to 08/31/2001  
CLEC: 7229 --

#### NOTES FOR REPORT ON CLEC LSR INFORMATION

This report contains information on all mechanically submitted, non-LNP LSRs that BellSouth processed for your company during the period noted above.

For the purpose of this report, an LSR is a distinct cc/pon/ver combination.

The data presented has several lines per LSR and where more than one line is needed to determine the status of an LSR (e.g., an LSR flows through when certain conditions are found/not found on three lines), it's still counted as one LSR.

Each different version of a particular PON is considered a separate LSR within BellSouth. Below, you will find explanations for each column and its contents.

CC -- Your company code.

PON -- Your purchase order number as received on the LSR.

VER -- The LSR version.

TIMESTAMP -- Timestamp of note or error posting in LEO database.

TYPE -- Notes type. See explanations of each type in the next section.

ERR# -- ENCORE error number. Please refer to your LEO Implementation Guide for complete explanations of each error number.

NOTE OR ERROR DESCRIPTION -- Actual text of the note or error as found in the LEO database.

When comparing the results of this LSR information file with the flow through aggregate report, please note that

this LSR Information file contains LSR data for all submission types, (LENS, EDI, TAG), but are separated by cc while there's a separate line for each submission type on the aggregate report, the intent of this LSR information file is for the reconciliation for all LSRs submitted regardless of submission type.

#### NOTES TYPES EXPLAINED

There are several different types of notes, each with its own unique identifier. Many of these are internal to BellSouth, and will not be useful to you. Others will tell you immediately the type of note that you are viewing. For example, a type of 'C280' refers to an internal BellSouth program which generated the note text, and 'ERR' means that the note text contains an actual error message.

Please note that each LSR may receive multiple errors and messages. All errors and messages must be taken into account in order to determine the treatment for that particular LSR.

TYPE	EXPLANATION
C###	Refers to the actual BellSouth program that generated the note text
CANC	Automatically cancelled by system due to inactivity
CLAR	Clarification message
CLM	LSR has been claimed
CRR	Mechanically generated order has been corrected
ERR	The notes field contains an error message, and the ERR# field is populated
FCCN	Manual FOC send
ISS	Manually issued order
LOAD	Successful change in the LEO database
MECH	Means that the LSR in question was received via a mechanized method
NAVI	Navigation message -- where the LSR was sent at that time
RETF	Return feed
SRET	SOCS return message
SGNT	LSR has been inserted to TSIGNOUT queue and is waiting to be claimed
WEB	Message is posted to the web (LENS)

#### FLOWTHROUGH LOGIC

This section contains an explanation of the process by which BellSouth determines whether or not an LSR has flowed through the system. Please note the following: as each of the flowthrough steps is executed, LSRs that meet that step's criteria are removed from the base pool of LSRs, and are not included in any further calculations. For example, an LSR with both an auto clarification and a MANUALP fallout condition will be counted only once in the flow through calculation. In this example, the LSR will appear in the planned manual 'bucket' since the manual fallout step is executed before the auto clarification step. In addition, an LSR with more than one error of the same type, e.g., auto clarification, will be counted only once in the flow through calculation. A list of all errors by error code and quantity can be found in the Flow Through Error Analysis report.

The steps for determining flowthrough are as follows (in order):

#### FATAL REJECTS

Finds all fatal reject records. A fatal reject is a record the system identifies as having severe CLEC errors that prohibit further processing and is returned to the CLEC. Fatal rejects are identified by looking for a note containing 'LSR REJECTED' and a note type of 'RETF' or 'C475', both of which indicate an LSR was rejected by the system. A fatally rejected LSR does not retain its initiating source system ID (i.e., LENS, EDI, TAG); therefore, it is impossible to determine the source of a fatal reject. Please note that fatal rejects are not a part of the flow through calculation and are NOT identified in this report.

#### AUTO CLARIFICATIONS

Finds all auto clarification records. An auto clarification record is a record the system identifies as having a CLEC error and returns the record to the CLEC with no further processing. All auto clarification LSRs contain the words 'AUTO CLARIFICATION' in the notes field.

#### PLANNED MANUALS

Finds all planned manual and manual clarification records. A planned manual LSR is an LSR that the system is not designed to handle mechanically due to its complexity. As a result, the LSR falls out for manual handling so that processing can be completed. A planned manual LSR will have the text 'MANUALP' as the first seven characters of the notes field.

#### FLOWTHROUGH LSRs

Finds all records that have had service orders issued in SOCS, i.e., all records that flowed through the system. An LSR is defined as having flowed through if the following logic is true:

\* The note contains the text 'FOC STAGED FOR LSR' \*\*\*OR\*\*\* 'FOC AND CN STAGED FOR LSR'

\*\*\*AND\*\*\*

\* The note contains the text 'ORDER NUM' \*\*\*OR\*\*\* 'INFO-ORDER' \*\*\*OR\*\*\* 'CANCELLED'

#### SYSTEM FALLOUT

Any LSRs that did not flow through the systems and were not planned manuals, fatal rejects, or auto clarifications are defined as system fallout.

#### CLEC CAUSED FALLOUT

CLEC caused fallout is defined as those LSRs with clarifications returned and/or clarifications posted.

#### CLARIFICATIONS RETURNED

Find all clarification returned LSRs. A clarification returned designation indicates that an LSR was received and was LESOG eligible, but could not flow through because additional information was required in order to process the LSR. The LSR requires a Bellsouth representative to review it; if the error is determined to be a CLEC error, the LSR is clarified back to the CLEC. This LSR contains the text 'CLARIFICATIONS RETURNED' in the notes field.

#### CLARIFICATIONS POSTED

Finds all clarifications posted LSRs. A clarification posted is identical to a clarification returned except that the clarification is posted to the web (LENS) rather than being sent to the CLEC via EDI or TAG. A clarification posted LSR contains the text 'CLARIFICATIONS POSTED' in the notes field.

#### BST CAUSED FALLOUT

All other LSRs that fall out of the system are counted, by default, as 'BST Caused Fallout'.

#### PENDING (Z) STATUS LSRS

There is no specific identifier in the tables which indicates that a LSR has received a 'Z' status. When a supplemental LSR is received before the original LSR has reached FOC status, the original LSR is marked with a 'Z' status. LSRs that receive this 'Z' status are excluded from the flowthrough calculation.

#### LSRS AND ASSOCIATED MESSAGES FOR THIS PERIOD

LIST OF LSRS WITH ACTIVITY DURING THE MONTH THAT WERE INCLUDED IN THIS MONTH'S FLOW THROUGH CALCULATION.

The following is a list of the LSRs originated this month and included in the flow through calculation, and all messages associated with each LSR received. Again, please remember that you must take into account all the messages and errors for each LSR to determine its treatment.

# **ATTACHMENT 22**



PON	VER	DATE	TIME	TYPE	ERR#	NOTES
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/23/01	11:55:33	BB18		LSR LOADED AS MECHANIZED
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/23/01	11:55:33	C070		DATA SENT TO DDC
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/23/01	11:55:55	C040		LSR HAS BEEN SENT TO LESOG
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/23/01	11:58:10	B050		PROCESSING OF SERVICE ORDER NO8
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/23/01	12:00:29	C020		INFO-ORDER NUM: DO87B531
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/23/01	12:00:29	C020		SERVICE ORDER UPDATE PLACED BY L
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/23/01	12:00:29	C020		INFO-ORDER NUM: NO8C6WV0
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/23/01	12:00:48	B050		8#5 FOC STAGED FOR LSR, LEO STATU
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/23/01	12:00:50	B025		855 ISSUED RETURN-FEED # 0001 FOC
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/29/01	14:43:50	B050		PREVIOUS FOC HAS BEEN SENT, NO A
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/29/01	14:43:50	B050		FOC, POS OR JEP WAS APPLIED TO LSR
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	9:00:28	SGNT		DB09A030 INSERTED TO TSIGNOUT
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	9:00:28	ERR	1000	TN 898-1586 IS ALREADY WORKING ON
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	9:00:31	CLAR		Clarify Requested for VER-9
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	9:00:31	SGNT		DB09A030 DELETED FROM TSIGNOUT
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	9:00:32	B025		CLARIFICATIONS RETURNED- 1000
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	9:00:32	B025		855 ISSUED RETURN-FEED # 0002 CLAR
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	9:01:01	B050		PREVIOUS FOC HAS BEEN SENT, NO A
S003753818BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	9:01:01	B050		FOC, POS OR JEP WAS APPLIED TO LSR
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/24/01	23:35:11	BB18		LSR LOADED AS MECHANIZED
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/24/01	23:35:12	C070		DATA SENT TO DDC
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/24/01	23:35:28	C040		LSR HAS BEEN SENT TO LESOG
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	5:45:06	B035		LSR RESENT - NOT YET RESOLVED IN L
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	5:45:07	C040		LSR HAS BEEN SENT TO LESOG
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:02:49	B050		PROCESSING OF SERVICE ORDER NO1
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:03:01	B050		PROCESSING OF SERVICE ORDER NO1
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:03:34	B050		PROCESSING OF SERVICE ORDER NO3
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:03:43	B050		PROCESSING OF SERVICE ORDER NO3
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:04:25	C020		INFO-ORDER NUM: DO1XDLT4
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:04:25	C020		SERVICE ORDER UPDATE PLACED BY L
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:04:25	C020		INFO-ORDER NUM: NO1Y7VF8
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:06:19	C020		INFO-ORDER NUM: DO3KHT34
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:06:19	C020		SERVICE ORDER UPDATE PLACED BY L
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:06:19	C020		INFO-ORDER NUM: NO3RG7R4
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:30:05	B050		8#5 FOC STAGED FOR LSR, LEO STATU
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:30:05	B025		855 ISSUED RETURN-FEED # 0001 FOC
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:30:05	B025		POS ISSUED, SOCS STATUS - PD P
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:30:06	B025		POS ISSUED, SOCS STATUS - PD P
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/25/01	6:30:07	B025		POS ISSUED, SOCS STATUS - PD P
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/28/01	16:51:21	B050		PREVIOUS FOC HAS BEEN SENT, NO A
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/28/01	16:51:21	B050		FOC, POS OR JEP WAS APPLIED TO LSR
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/28/01	16:51:24	B050		PREVIOUS FOC HAS BEEN SENT, NO A
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/28/01	16:51:24	B050		FOC, POS OR JEP WAS APPLIED TO LSR
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/31/01	17:25:30	B050		865 COMPLETION STAGED FOR LSR, LE
S004096996BSGAPR	0	8/31/01	17:25:30	B025		865 ISSUED RETURN-FEED # 0005 COM
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/29/01	23:30:23	BB18		LSR LOADED AS MECHANIZED
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/29/01	23:30:23	C070		DATA SENT TO DDC
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/29/01	23:30:28	C040		LSR HAS BEEN SENT TO LESOG
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	5:45:02	B035		LSR RESENT - NOT YET RESOLVED IN L
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	5:45:03	C040		LSR HAS BEEN SENT TO LESOG
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:05:31	B050		PROCESSING OF SERVICE ORDER NO1
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:05:53	B050		PROCESSING OF SERVICE ORDER NO0
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:05:55	B050		PROCESSING OF SERVICE ORDER NO1
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:06:58	C020		INFO-ORDER NUM: DO119H35

S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:06:58 C020	SERVICE ORDER UPDATE PLACED BY L
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:06:58 C020	INFO-ORDER NUM: NO12YND1
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:07:01 C020	INFO-OUT TO SOER
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:07:01 C020	SERVICE ORDER UPDATE PLACED BY L
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:07:01 C020	INFO-ORDER NUM: DO0VPVP2
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:07:01 C020	INFO-ORDER NUM: NO0WBWB0
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:30:12 B050	8#5 FOC STAGED FOR LSR, LEO STATU
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:30:12 B050	PREVIOUS FOC HAS BEEN SENT, NO A
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:30:12 B050	FOC, POS OR JEP WAS APPLIED TO LSR
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:30:14 B025	855 ISSUED RETURN-FEED # 0001 FOC
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	6:30:14 B025	POS ISSUED, SOCS STATUS - PD P
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	13:37:37 B050	PREVIOUS FOC HAS BEEN SENT, NO A
S004176269BSGAPR	0	8/30/01	13:37:37 B050	FOC, POS OR JEP WAS APPLIED TO LSR

C6WV0 IN STATUS AO DELAYED: WAITING FOR LESOG RESPONSE

ESOG

S CHANGED TO "F"  
SENT  
ACTION TAKEN.  
R NO RETFD

ANOTHER ACC, PLS SUBMIT NEW DRS TN. JSM

IFICATION REQUESTED  
ACTION TAKEN.  
R NO RETFD

ESOG

Y7VF8 IN STATUS AO DELAYED: WAITING FOR LESOG RESPONSE  
Y7VF8 IN STATUS PD DELAYED: WAITING FOR LESOG RESPONSE  
RG7R4 IN STATUS AO DELAYED: WAITING FOR LESOG RESPONSE  
RG7R4 IN STATUS PD DELAYED: WAITING FOR LESOG RESPONSE

ESOG

ESOG

S CHANGED TO "F"  
SENT  
ENDING ORDER  
ENDING ORDER  
ENDING ORDER  
ACTION TAKEN.  
R NO RETFD  
ACTION TAKEN.  
R NO RETFD  
O STATUS CHANGED TO "P"  
PLETION SENT

ESOG

2YND1 IN STATUS AO DELAYED: WAITING FOR LESOG RESPONSE  
WBWB0 IN STATUS AO DELAYED: WAITING FOR LESOG RESPONSE  
2YND1 IN STATUS PD DELAYED: WAITING FOR LESOG RESPONSE

ESOG

ESOG

S CHANGED TO "F"  
ACTION TAKEN.  
R NO RETFD  
SENT  
ENDING ORDER  
ACTION TAKEN.  
R NO RETFD

# **ATTACHMENT 23**

---

**BellSouth Interconnection Services**

1960 West Exchange Place  
Suite 420  
Tucker, Georgia 30084

October 17, 2001

Ms. Amanda Hill  
Manager - Carrier Management  
WorldCom  
Two Northwinds Center  
2520 Northwinds Parkway  
Suite 500  
Alpharetta, Georgia 30004

Dear Amanda:

This is in response to your e-mails dated August 14 and September 6, 2001, requesting that BellSouth investigate 10 MCI metro (MCI m) telephone numbers to determine the reason they did not appear in BellSouth's line loss notifications that are provided to MCI m via BellSouth's Network Data Mover (NDM). These particular reports serve as notification to the Competitive Local Exchange Carrier (CLEC) community that a customer has switched to a different local service provider.

BellSouth researched the NDM transmission history, and found that the line loss notification reports have been sent in a timely manner. However, in reviewing the NDM files it was determined that of the 10 telephone numbers MCI m provided, 5 telephone numbers did not appear on NDM reports because of service order issuance errors by BellSouth, which prevented the telephone numbers from transmitting to the NDM file. BellSouth has covered the Business Office service representatives regarding the importance of using correct disconnect identifiers and information when issuing service orders of this nature so that the telephone numbers will post to your NDM line loss report.

The other 5 telephone numbers are not considered losses that would be reflected on the NDM loss notification reports. 3 of the telephone numbers were claimed by the end users to be unauthorized changes of service to MCI m. Accounts disconnected due to claims of unauthorized change of service are not listed on the NDM loss report. MCI m cancelled the Purchase Order Number (PON) for 1 telephone number. Thus, the service/customer was never switched to MCI m. The remaining telephone number is still an MCI m account according to our records. Please refer to the attached matrix for the details for each telephone number involved.

As you are aware, in addition to providing the line loss notification information via the NDM to MCI m, BellSouth provides a Line Loss Report, which is posted to the BellSouth Interconnection Services' Web site at:

<https://clec.bellsouth.com>

This report is a bit different from the NDM report, as losses due to claims of slamming are included on the Web site report. Also, the identifier that causes the order to post to the NDM report is not necessary for the telephone number to appear on the Web site report. Thus, 8 of the 10 telephone numbers you provided were included in the Line Loss Reports. This information remains on the BellSouth Interconnection Services' Web site for seven calendar days.

I trust that the above information satisfies your concerns regarding this matter. Please feel free to call me at 770-492-7543, if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Pamela D. Reynolds  
Industrial Specialist

Attachment

cc: Shannon Waters

Account Number	CC	MAN	Posted to	BellSouth Response
404 241-3169		7229 error	Interconnection Website only	MAN FID error prevented transmitting to NDM file
404 349-0504		7229	7229 Interconnection Website only	Remark section error prevented transmitting to NDM file
404 349-2056				MCI request cancel PON, Acct belongs to BST
404 370-0252		7229 error	Interconnection Website only	MAN FID error prevented transmitting to NDM file
404 758-1258		7229	7229 Interconnection Website only	Remark section error prevented transmitting to NDM file
404 761-3326		7229	7229 Interconnection Website only	Remark section error prevented transmitting to NDM file
404 792-0664				Account belongs to MCI, no Line Loss Report needed
404 794-2712		7229	Interconnection Website only	Disconnect reason of SE (switched in error) prevented transmitting to NDM file
678 513-0298		7229	7229 Interconnection Website only	Disconnect reason of SE (switched in error) prevented transmitting to NDM file
678 560-2452		7229	7229 Interconnection Website only	Disconnect reason of SE (switched in error) prevented transmitting to NDM file